



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/206,027	12/04/1998	BARNEY M. COHEN	AMAT/3049/MD	4950

7590 11/20/2001

APPLIED MATERIALS INC  
PATENT COUNSEL  
P O BOX 450 A  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95052

EXAMINER

VINH, LAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/206,027

Applicant(s)

COHEN ET AL.

Examiner

LAN VINH

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Prosecution Application*

1. The request filed on 10/5/2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/206027 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 24-25, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konecni et al. (EP 0849 779 A2)

Konecni discloses a process for forming a semiconductor structure using plasma etching comprising exposed a patterned substrate to a plasma generated from a gas mixture of argon, helium and hydrogen in a processing chamber/ a plasma generated from a gas mixture consisting of argon, helium and hydrogen ( col 3, lines 52-57; col 6, lines 40-47 and fig. 4 )

Unlike the instant claimed invention as per claims 1, 3, 24, Konecni does not disclose the specific percent by volume ( etchant concentration/flow rate) of argon, helium, hydrogen in the gas mixture although Konecni discloses that his method comtemplates any suitable flow rates of the gases ( col 4, lines 1-2 )

However, in a method of plasma etching, it is well known in the art that etching parameters such as etchant concentration and flow rate affect both the rate and quality of the plasma etching process.

Therefore, since Konecni discloses that any suitable flow rates of gas can be used, it would have been obvious to adjust Konecni's gases flow rate by optimizing the same by conducting routine experimentation for the purpose of obtaining the best etch rate.

Regarding claim 5, Konecni discloses that the substrate surface comprises silicon oxide (col 5, lines 24-26 )

Regarding claim 6, Konecni discloses that the plasma is capacitively and inductively powered by bias power (col 3, lines 42-44 )

Regarding claims 7, 28, Konecni discloses introducing argon, helium, hydrogen into the processing chamber to establish a low or vacuum pressure of  $10^{-7}$  to  $10^{-8}$  Torr ( col 4, lines 34-35; col 6, lines 30-45 )

Regarding claim 30, Konecni discloses generating the plasma by delivering power level of between 150-450 W to the processing chamber ( col 3, lines 40-43 )

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 24-25, 27-30 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran et al. ( US 5,534,445 )

Tran discloses a method for fabricating a thin film transistor. This method comprises the step of exposing a patterned substrate to a plasma generated by a gas mixture of hydrogen with inerts gases such as argon and helium/a gas mixture consisting of argon, helium and hydrogen ( col 4, lines 49-51 ).

Unlike the instant claimed invention as per claims 1, 3, Tran does not disclose the specific percent by volume ( etchant concentration/flow rate) of argon, helium, hydrogen in the gas mixture.

However, in a method of plasma etching, it is well known in the art that etching parameters such as etchant concentration and flow rate affect both the rate and quality of the plasma etching process.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to adjust Tran's gases flow rate by optimizing the same by conducting routine experimentation for the purpose of obtaining the best etch rate.

Regarding claim 5, Tran discloses that the substrate surface comprises silicon oxide ( col 4, lines 20-21 )

Regarding claim 6, Tran discloses that the plasma is derived by radio frequency supply ( col 4, lines 56-57 ) reads on the plasma is capacitively and inductively powered

Regarding claims 7, 28, Tran discloses a pressure in the chamber at 180 mTorr ( col 5, lines 47-48 )

Regarding claim 30, Tran discloses generating the plasma by delivering power level of 20 W to the processing chamber ( col 4, lines 47-49 )

5. Claims 4, 8, 10-23, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konecni et al. (EP 0849 779 A2) in view of Kennard (US 5,935,874 )

Claims 4, 8, 10-23, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran et al. (US 5,534,445 ) in view of Kennard (US 5,935,874 )

Konecni's method has been described above in paragraph 3. Tran's method has been described above in paragraph 4. Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claims 4, 8, 14, Konecni/Tran does not specifically disclose the step of increasing the helium content/flow rate to increase etching of the patterned substrate surface.

However, Kennard discloses a method for plasma etching a trench comprises the step of adding/increasing a flow volume of helium to a gas mixture chemistry ( col 3, lines 58-60 )

Therefore, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to modify Konecni/Tran by increasing the helium content/flow rate to the gas mixture as per Kennard especially because Kennard teaches that it is believed that the addition of a relatively high flow volume of helium improves the directionality of the etch by increasing the ion energy, thereby increasing the vertical etch rate into the trench ( col 4, lines 5-9 ). Furthermore, it is also well known in the art that etching parameters such as etchant concentration and flow rate affect both the rate and quality of the plasma etching process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to adjust Konecni/Tran helium flow rate by optimizing the same by conducting routine experimentation for the purpose of obtaining the best etch rate.

Regarding claims 10, 15, 18-20, the detailed discussion regarding the specific claimed flow rates has been discussed above in paragraph 3.


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Giunn et al. (US 5,877,032 ) discloses varying etching parameters such as flow rate, pressure to change/affect the etch rate of the substrate during plasma etching ( col 4, lines 4-8 )

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAN VINH whose telephone number is 703 305-6302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 -6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BENJAMIN L UTECH can be reached on 703 308-3836. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9310 for regular communications and 703 872-9311 for After Final communications.

  
BENJAMIN L. UTECH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

LV  
November 9, 2001